

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 51, 53, 57, 59, 63 and 65 are currently being amended.

Claims 69-86 are being added.

This amendment adds and changes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 51-86 are now pending in this application.

Claim objections

Claims 53, 59 and 65 were objected to for informalities. Claims 53, 59 and 65 have been amended as suggested by the Patent Office, thus overcoming the objection thereto.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 51, 52, 57, 58, 63 and 64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,222,157 to Yoneda et al. (“Yoneda”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,555,099 to Telle (“Telle”). Claims 53, 54, 59, 60, 65 and 66 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoneda and Telle, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,453,127 to Wood (“Wood”). Claims 55, 56, 61, 62, 67 and 68 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoneda and Telle, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,984,446 to Silverbrook (“Silverbrook”). These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 51, as amended, recites:

An image forming apparatus comprising:

receiving section configured to receive a plurality of pages of image data transmitted through a communication line and to receive a partial print request signal requesting that only a part of the image data be printed; and

storage section configured to store the image data and the partial print request-signal, both received at the receiving section;

first printing section configured to perform a trial print printing a part of the image data and a sentence or a mark on a paper sheet in response to the partial print request signal stored in the storage section, the sentence or the mark indicating that the trial print is the printing of the part of the image data; and

second printing section configured to print all pages of the image data stored in the storage section, upon receiving an all-page print instruction after the first printing section has printed the part of the image data, said all-page print instruction demanding that the image data be printed in a specific fashion.

Yoneda and Telle fail to disclose or suggest at least the above italicized feature of claim 1 of a “first printing section configured to perform a trial print printing a part of the image data and a sentence or a mark on a paper sheet in response to the partial print request signal stored in the storage section, the sentence or the mark indicating that the trial print is the printing of the part of the image data.”

In claim 51, the first printing section is configured to print on the paper sheet in response to the partial print request signal both the part of the image as well as a sentence or a mark indicating that the trial print is the printing of the part of the image data. For example, in one non-limiting example as shown in FIG. 4, in addition to the part of the image, “THIS IS A TRIAL PRINT” is printed on the paper sheet indicating that the printed data is a “TRIAL PRINT”. This printing on the paper sheet of the sentence or mark shows the user that this is a trial print. In this way, the printed paper sheet is able to show the user that a part from all pages of the printed data is a partial printing for trial printing in order to determine if there are any failures to the printing settings or printing functions. By displaying the mark or sentence in this manner, the consumption of paper due to printing mistakes can be prevented. By checking a part of the printed results, the consumption of paper can ultimately be reduced and a reliable printed result for all pages can be obtained.

In contrast to claim 51, nowhere does Yoneda nor Telle disclose the feature of a “first printing section configured to perform a trial print printing a part of the image data and a sentence or a mark on a paper sheet in response to the partial print request signal stored in the storage section, the sentence or the mark indicating that the trial print is the printing of the part of the image data.” The Patent Office on page 3 of the Office Action cites to FIG. 12 of Yoneda, which discloses a partial print button, and col. 17, lines 63-68 and col. 18, lines 1-7, for disclosing a first printing section configured to perform a trial print on a paper sheet in response to the partial print request signal stored in the storage section. Nowhere, however, does Yoneda disclose that in its partial print, an image is printed to a paper where the image includes a “sentence or the mark indicating that the trial print is the printing of the part of the image data.” That is, in the partial printing of Yoneda, there is no printing on a paper an image such as “THIS IS A TRIAL PRINT” or “THIS IS A PARTIAL PRINT”, for example.

Telle fails to cure the deficiencies of Yoneda. Telle, in col. 9, lines 47-49 cited by the Patent Office, does not disclose “printing a part of the image data and a sentence or a mark on a paper sheet in response to the partial print request signal stored in the storage section, the sentence or the mark indicating that the trial print is the printing of the part of the image data.” Rather, Telle merely discloses providing page number identifying indicia on a proof set of a document to be printed. Telle does not disclose indicating to the user that the printed matter in its proof set is a trial print by printing a sentence or a mark indicating the trial print such as “THIS IS A TRIAL PRINT” or “THIS IS A PARTIAL PRINT”, for example.

Wood and Silverbrook were cited for disclosing other features of the claims, but fail to cure the deficiencies of Yoneda and Telle.

Independent claims 57, 63, 69 and 78 have features corresponding to those discussed above with respect to claim 51, and are patentable for analogous reasons.

The dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as their respective independent claims as well as for further patentable features recited therein.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing or a credit card payment form being unsigned, providing incorrect information resulting in a rejected credit card transaction, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date December 31, 2009

By Thomas G. Bilodeau

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6162
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Pavan K. Agarwal
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 40,888

Thomas G. Bilodeau
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 43,438